


REMARKS

In response to the office communication of July 7, 2004, applicants have previously canceled claims 1-4 in view of the prior art. Claim 5 was previously written as a new base claim including any intervening claims. Applicants continue to disagree with the examiner's rejection of claims 5 & 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103, because none of the stated prior art describes nor suggests putting wound-sealing wax in combination with honey upon gauze which is attached to the support strip of material. Kalish describes an impregnated bandage, but does not describe combining honey and wound-sealing wax and putting them upon the gauze. Mousa describes a honey preparation including beeswax, but does not teach the feature of putting honey and wound-sealing wax on the gauze which is attached to the support strip of material. The feature and limitation of disposing wound-sealing wax upon the gauze along with the honey is not described, nor suggested in any of the prior art in whole or even in part. Nowhere is it suggested nor disclosed to dispose wound-sealing wax on gauze in combination with honey other than in the present invention. As result, this particular feature and limitation is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 which states that in order for a claim to obvious.

Applicants have not added any new subject matter to the claims and respectfully request that the examiner takes the foregoing into consideration and that they be granted Letters Patent for their invention.

Respectfully Submitted,
For: Paul D. Unger & Victor Unger
By: 
David A. Lingbeck Reg. No. 34,861
P.O. Box 500
St. Michael, Minnesota 55376 (763) 497-0529